

APPLICANT(S): Zvi Reznik et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/574,023
FILED: 01/17/2007
Page 12

REMARKS

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 12 to 54 were pending in the application. Claims 12 to 54 have been rejected. Claims 12, 26, 42 and 50 have been voluntarily amended for clarification purposes.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter and are fully supported by the disclosure of the application as filed.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 Rejections

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 26, 28-29, 33-34, 36, 37, and 39-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Schreiber (Proceedings of the IEEE, vol 83, No 6).

Claims 12-22, 24-25, 27,31-32,35, and 38.were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Seroussi (US . 5,764,374), and various other secondary reference in combination with Shreiber were used as the basis of 103 rejection of all the pending dependent claims – as repeated from the previous office action.

Applicants respectfully traverse all the 102 and 103 rejections which are entirely or partially based on Schreiber in view of the fact that Schreiber suggests video transmission techniques based on the MPEG standard (multi-frame compression), while the pending independent claims, as originally filed and more specifically after amendment, are directed to

APPLICANT(S): Zvi Reznik et al.

SERIAL NO.: 10/574,023

FILED: 01/17/2007

Page 13

generating and transmitting together both coarse and fine data derived from and relating to the same “first” video image frame. Conversely, the teachings of Schreiber are directed to transmitting MPEG delta frame information where the “refinement portion” to which the examiner points is error correction data used to correct for prediction errors attributed to the application of perdition vectors/coding of a current frame to a previous frame (either an I-frame or frame generated by applying a previous delta frame at the sink).

In the interest of constructively furthering the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has voluntarily amended independent claims 12, 26, 42 and 50 to further highlight the point that the compression and transmission methods claimed are directed to compression and transmission of a data on a frame by frame basis, without any reference to any previous or future frames, as common in the MPEG standard and as taught by the Shreiber reference.

In rebutting Applicant’s previous arguments regarding the distinctions between the claimed invention and the Shreiber reference, the Examiner states that *Fig.6 in Schreiber clearly shows that MPEG video compression is perform in the coarse level, but the coarse signal is reconstructed by adding the prediction and the residual (delta in applicant's notation), and then it is subtracted from the original signal to give a rise to the next level (refinement level)*. Applicant notes that prediction vectors are firmly an MPEG concept/method, wherein a prediction vector is generated as part of a given delta frame for a given complete frame by comparing the given complete frame against a previous complete frame. The prediction vector is intended to allow an MPEG decoder (that receives the delta frame) to convert a previously received frame into some coarse prediction (prediction frame) of the given complete frame, and the error correction data sent with the prediction vectors (in the same delta frame) allow the decoder to make touchups to the prediction frame. To summarize, Shreiber teaches the transmission of prediction (coarse data) and error correction (fine data) which was generated by comparing the frame to be transmitted against a previous frame. All the pending independent claims, however, recite that both the course and fine representations are based exclusively on processing/compression of a single frame relative to itself.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of all the 102 and 103 rejections based on the Shreiber reference. In view of the foregoing remarks and

APPLICANT(S): Zvi Reznik et al.
SERIAL NO.: 10/574,023
FILED: 01/17/2007
Page 14

voluntary amendments, all the pending claims are considered to be allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any questions or comments as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

/Vladimir Sherman/

Vladimir Sherman
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 43,116

Dated: May 11, 2011

Eitan Mehulal Law Group
10 Abba Eban Blvd., P.O.B. 2081
Herzlia 46120, Israel
General Phone: (703) 486-1150
Facsimile: (703) 892-4510